



## Western Integrated Pest Management Center

### **2022-26 Planning Document and Economic Analysis of IPM Systems Request for Applications**

The Western IPM Center is opening its RFA for IPM Planning Documents and Economic Analysis of IPM Systems Grant Program. Proposals will be accepted year-round and considered on a rolling basis. There is no deadline to apply and approximately \$200,000 will be available from 2022-2026.

The electronic proposal management system requires that information for the proposal body be filled into form fields. The exceptions are the Application, Conflict of Interest and Current and Pending Support forms that are supplied as Microsoft Word documents – project directors should have these filled out and uploaded as PDF files. Electronic signatures are acceptable on the Application Form.

Applicants must register at <https://grants.ipmcenters.org>

If you encounter any problems or have questions, contact Matt Baur at 530 750-1271 or [mebaur@ucanr.edu](mailto:mebaur@ucanr.edu).

## I. GENERAL INFORMATION

The Western Integrated Pest Management Center (“The Center”) engages a broad diversity of stakeholders in the West to identify strategic directions and set priorities for integrated pest management (IPM) research, education, and extension for pest management in all settings. Through these activities the Center promotes the USDA Research, Education, and Economics Action Plan goals of effective, affordable, and environmentally sound integrated pest management practices and improved response to emerging or reemerging pests of high consequence. The Center supports the *National Roadmap for Integrated Pest Management* (<http://bit.ly/IPMRoadMap>)

The Center works to reduce the risks that pests and pest-management practices pose to people, the environment and the economy of the American West by supporting the development and adoption of smart, safe and sustainable pest management. Our vision is a healthier West with fewer pests.

This RFA covers Planning Documents and Economic Analysis projects. This includes the development of Pest Management Strategic Plans, Integrated Pest Management Plans, Pest Management Priority-setting for First Nation Food Sovereignty Initiatives, or similar planning documents, and Economic Analysis of IPM Systems.

*Pest Management Strategic Plans* (PMSPs) are developed with a group of producers and other stakeholders to identify the pest management needs and priorities of a particular commodity, industry, system, site or setting. The plans document current pest management practices and those under research and demonstration trial development. The plans also indicate priorities for research to fill knowledge gaps, regulatory changes, and education or training programs to support adoption of integrated pest management practices.

There are two current models for producing PMSPs, and either is acceptable.

- Guidelines for producing a traditional PMSP can be found on the National IPM Database web site at [https://ipmdata.ipmcenters.org/pmsp\\_workshopguidelines.pdf](https://ipmdata.ipmcenters.org/pmsp_workshopguidelines.pdf)
- Guidelines for producing an Integrated Pest Management Strategic Plan, an approach pioneered by researchers at Oregon State University, can be found at <https://catalog.extension.oregonstate.edu/em9238>

*Pest Management Priority-setting for First Nation Food Sovereignty Initiatives* may query producers, pest management professionals, IPM practitioners or other pest management stakeholders to gather information about the current pest management methods and challenges in a particular commodity, system, site or setting.

*The Economic Analysis of IPM Systems* assessment focuses on the economic impacts associated with IPM practices in commodity, industry, system, sites or settings. As an example, the Crop Pest-Loss and Impact Assessment Signature Program tracks the economic impacts associated with IPM implementation. For more information on Signature Programs, see the Center Projects section of the [westernipm.org](http://westernipm.org) website. Additional recent examples include the economic analysis of the IR-4 program (available at [www.ir4project.org/outreach/](http://www.ir4project.org/outreach/)), the economic value of screening grapevines for viruses (available at doi: 10.5344/ajev.2020.19047) the University of California IPM program (2016 ARE Update University of California Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics).

**Available funds.** Funding of approximately \$200,000 is available in this competitive grant program. Individual awards are capped at \$15,000. Budgets may include indirect charges of no more than 30% of Total Federal Funds (TFF).

**Who may apply?** Eligible applicants include private individuals and institutions, faculty and qualified staff of two- and four-year universities, businesses, commodity organizations, First Nations, and governmental and non-governmental organizations. The project director (PD) must be in the Western Region, but co-project directors may be from outside the region. The Western Region includes the following states, territories and islands: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, American Samoa, the Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands. Federally-recognized First Nations within these broad geographic boundaries east to Colorado, north to Alaska, west to Palau and south to American Samoa are eligible to apply.

**Proposal submission.** All applications will be submitted through a secure online system at [grants.ipmcenters.org](https://grants.ipmcenters.org). There is no set deadline for proposal submission, and applications will be considered on a rolling basis.

**Proposal timeline.** Projects should last one year

## **II. CENTER PRIORITIES**

Stakeholders from the 17 Western states, Pacific Island territories, and First Nations identify priorities for the Western IPM Center, and the Center is committed to addressing those pest management needs. The following are regional priorities established by the Western IPM Center Advisory Committee and stakeholders, and proposals should specifically address one or more of these priorities:

The list below is not ranked and explanations are to illustrate concepts and for clarity and are not designed to be all-encompassing or exclusionary.

**IPM for Indigenous, Insular and Isolated People** – Promoting IPM for underserved communities and audiences.

**IPM in Changing Landscapes** – Creating IPM tools and tactics for landscapes changed by natural forces, including climate and fire.

**IPM Culture and Capacity** – Enhancing the acceptance of IPM, strengthening the networks, structures and institutions that promote it, and developing new scientists to lead it.

**IPM in New Places** – Promoting IPM to new, challenging and changing industries, such as animal agriculture, aquaculture, chemically intensive cropping systems, urban farming, indoor production, etc.

**Invasive Species** – Creating IPM responses to invasive pests and resurgent native pests disrupting IPM programs.

**Biological Control of Pests** – For insects, weeds, diseases and vertebrate pests

**IPM and Ecosystem Services** – Using IPM to protect and promote ecosystem services in managed and natural landscapes.

**Soil-Borne Pest Management** – Developing IPM tactics to manage soil-borne pests.

**Urban Pest Management** – Promoting IPM for homes, schools and communities, including the safe use of pesticides in homes and gardens.

**New Technologies to Manage Pests** – Developing novel and non-traditional approaches to managing insects, weeds, diseases and vertebrate pests.

**IPM for Pest-Resistance Management** – Developing IPM tools and techniques to reduce pest development of resistance.

### **III. REGIONAL INVOLVEMENT**

For projects where regional involvement is appropriate, the project director should include participants from all or some of those states, islands, territories and/or First Nations involved in production of the commodity or involved in the industry addressed in the planning document or economic analysis. If regional involvement is not appropriate, the project director should explain why it is not appropriate in the narrative section.

### **IV. MATCHING FUNDS**

No matching funds are required.

### **V. TERMS & CONDITIONS**

Recipients of Western IPM Center grant recipients are held to the same Research Terms and Conditions and NIFA Agency Specific Terms and Conditions available at [nifa.usda.gov/terms-and-conditions](https://nifa.usda.gov/terms-and-conditions). Complimentary to the Code of Federal Regulations and the Agency Specific Terms and Conditions, the NIFA Federal Assistance Policy Guide also provides direction for recipients of NIFA-funded grants and is available at [nifa.usda.gov/policy-guide](https://nifa.usda.gov/policy-guide)

### **VI. EVALUATION AND SELECTION CRITERIA**

A panel of reviewers will evaluate all applications. Most reviewers are from outside the Western Region, so when writing the proposal narrative and your biosketch, do not assume that reviewers will be familiar with Western crops, pest or conditions, or your program, abilities or past accomplishments. The review panel will score applications using the Proposal Score Sheet below.

**PROPOSAL SCORE SHEET**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Planning Document/Pest Management Strategic Plans</b>
Preparation (10 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information is clearly presented</li> <li>• Meets all format requirements with all required forms and components included</li> </ul>
Problem and justification (20 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project fills a gap in the IPM Planning Document or Economic Analysis portfolio</li> <li>• Proposal addresses one or more regional priority areas (listed on Page 2) and explains how the project goals align with the priority areas listed</li> <li>• Regional involvement requirement is met (as outlined in Section III)</li> </ul>
Potential for Success (25 points) -Objective -Approach -Procedures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PMSPs use Regional IPM Center's standard format and procedures, or the Integrated PMSP approach</li> <li>• Other planning document types or economic analysis meet accepted standards for information collection, analysis and summarization</li> <li>• Collaborators have agreed to participate through letters of support</li> </ul>
Underserved population (10 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project is led by or involves historically underserved stakeholders who have had limited participation in, or have received limited benefits from USDA programs. This includes limited resource and socially disadvantaged farmers/ranchers/landowners, and EPSCoR states</li> <li>• A socially disadvantaged group has been subjected to racial, ethnic, or other prejudice without regard to their individual qualities. Examples include: Pacific Islanders, Alaska Natives, First Nations, Hispanics, and African Americans</li> <li>• The proposal must provide evidence of a specific relationship in the Key Personnel section or provide evidence that the underserved audience will be engaged in the Problem and Justification and/or Outcomes section</li> <li>• How the project addresses a need of historically underserved stakeholders should be addressed if the project is focused on historically underserved stakeholders and how they will be engaged in the process</li> </ul>
Outputs & Outcomes (15 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outputs clearly relate to project goals and IPM Center priorities</li> <li>• Outcomes clearly relate to IPM Center priorities</li> <li>• Methods and indicators for measuring outcomes are clearly described</li> </ul>
Expertise & Participation (15 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biosketches indicate project directors and team have the expertise needed to successfully complete the project</li> <li>• Project actively involves end-users (farmers and ranchers, land managers, school and housing administrators, etc.) as well as students, as appropriate</li> </ul>
Budget (5 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget is well-defined, reasonable for the proposed project, and within the project funding limits described in this RFA</li> <li>• Proposed project costs are reasonable, allocable and allowable per Title 2: 2 CFR Part 200 – Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards</li> <li>• Budget narrative follows the order of the budget form and fully justifies budget items</li> </ul>

## **VII. APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION**

**Applications are accepted throughout the year and there is no set deadline.**

Applications are submitted electronically and applicants will have to register at [grants.ipmcenters.org](https://grants.ipmcenters.org).

### **Application Form**

Project information and certifications such as compliance with the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA), and Audit and Financial Certification are included in the Application Form. The form should be signed by the Authorized Organizational Representative (AOR). Electronic signatures are acceptable.

### **Project Narrative (Limit 4000 words):**

#### **Project Summary (word limit 500)**

Provide a concise summary of the project proposal

#### **Problem and Justification (word limit 1000)**

Describe the problem and how this project is expected to contribute to addressing it. Include citations that document the stakeholder-identified needs addressed by the proposed project, and the regional priority area or areas the project addresses. Applicants should clearly explain how the project will address Center priorities.

#### **Objectives (word limit 500)**

Include concise and complete statements defining the project objectives. The nature of the project and its objectives will determine the ease of predicting success.

#### **Procedures (word limit 1000)**

Describe proposed procedures that detail the working plans and methods designed to achieve each objective. The procedure statement must show that the proposed work has the potential to accomplish the objectives.

#### **Outputs (Word limit 250)**

Outputs may include Pest Management Strategic Plans, Integrated Pest Management Strategic Plans, Food Sovereignty Pest Management Priority Lists, Economic Analysis of IPM Systems document or other similar. Outputs may also include publications in peer reviewed or other professional or non-professional journals, grant proposals, new collaborative work groups, conferences, demonstrations, presentations at professional science society, extension or other meetings or field days, websites, technical reports, and white papers.

Pest Management Strategic Plans and Integrated Pest Management Strategic Plans are not considered complete until they are approved by the Center and published on the National IPM Centers' database.

**Outcomes (Word limit 500)**

Proposals must address two key points: (1) expected outcomes and how the outcomes relate to the Western IPM Center priorities identified above, and (2) methods and indicators to measure progress towards the expected outcomes.

Please describe how the proposed outputs will be used to advance IPM adoption in the West and support Center priorities. How will the proposed outputs be used in developing needed next steps for the project or program? A short-term outcome might be the knowledge gains realized by attracting funding to fill knowledge gaps with research data. A medium-term outcome might be the adoption of an IPM practice or program by producers as a result of an economic analysis that demonstrates a net economic benefit. A long-term outcome might include First Nations achieving food sovereignty through effective pest management strategies that were researched and extended as a result of the strategic planning process.

Although not required, a logic model can be included in the Supporting Documents. A logic model is a useful tool for developing short-, medium-, and long-term outcomes. More information about logic models can be found at [www.nifa.usda.gov/logic-model-planning-process](http://www.nifa.usda.gov/logic-model-planning-process). Additional information concerning logic models, outcomes and evaluation methodology can be found at [ipmimpacts.ucanr.edu](http://ipmimpacts.ucanr.edu).

**Cooperation of Key Personnel and Institutional Units Involved (250 words)**

Identify key personnel and each institutional unit contributing to the project. In multiple-institution applications, each institution must be identified, and the lead institution designated.

Applications must clearly define the roles and responsibilities of each person and institutional unit of the project team, if applicable.

If the project includes consulting, collaborative, or sub-contract arrangements, such agreements must be fully explained and justified in the budget narrative. Evidence must be provided that the project co-directors and collaborators involved have agreed to render these services. Acceptable documentation for this purpose includes letters of intent or statements of work from the individual or organization. Copies of either letters or email messages from the project co-directors and collaborators will suffice for this purpose. Letters of intent or letters of support from stakeholders should be included in the Supporting Documents Section.

**Literature Cited (1000 words)**

Please provide citations for any literature cited in the proposal.

**Budget**

The budget needs to include the following sections that apply to the proposed project: Indirect costs; Materials and supplies; Other direct costs; Outreach; Personnel - Salaries/Wages and Fringe Benefits; Printing and Publication Costs; Subcontracts/Cooperating Institutions; Subcontracts/Mini-grants; Travel. The budget form must be followed by a narrative that fully justifies each of the budget items and follows the order of the budget form.

### **Conflict of interest (COI) and Current and Pending (C&P)**

COI and C&P forms need to be filled out by the Project Director and each co-Project Director and uploaded as a single pdf file into the grant management system.

### **Supporting Documents**

Letters of support: Please include letters of support from project partners and stakeholders. The project partner letters and stakeholder letters should be collated into separate PDF files (one for project partners and the other for stakeholder letters) and attached into the Supporting Documents section.

### **VIII. FINAL REPORT**

A final technical report is required in addition to the planning document. A final report must be submitted to the Western IPM Center no later than 60 days after the expiration of the project.

### **IX. SUBMISSION OF APPLICATIONS**

Applicants will have to register at [grants.ipmcenters.org](https://grants.ipmcenters.org) and applications will be submitted there. Tutorials about the grant system are available at:  
[www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLbGDFwpS4sk7LMIQjLNicFCajhsj9WVwR](https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLbGDFwpS4sk7LMIQjLNicFCajhsj9WVwR)

If you have questions or problems with the submission system, please contact

Matt Baur, Director  
Western Integrated Pest Management Center  
Phone: 530-750-1271 Email: [mebaur@ucanr.edu](mailto:mebaur@ucanr.edu)  
[www.westernipm.org](http://www.westernipm.org)

The Regional IPM Centers are supported by the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture and comply with the USDA-NIFA nondiscrimination policy ([www.csrees.usda.gov/about/nondiscrimination.html](http://www.csrees.usda.gov/about/nondiscrimination.html)).